

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 13 remain pending in this application. In response to the Office Action of March 12, 2003, in which all claims were rejected, claim 1 has been amended. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter.

Claims 1 through 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,369,909 (Shima). Shima has been applied to independent claim 1 and each of the remaining dependent claims. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the identical disclosure in a single reference of each element of a claimed invention, such that the identically claimed invention is placed into the recognized possession of one having ordinary skill in the art. *Elan Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Mayo Foundation*, \_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_, 64 USPQ2d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Crown Operations International Ltd. v. Solutia Inc.*, 289 F.3d 1367, 62 USPQ2d 1917 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Independent claim 1 has been amended herein to distinguish, in at least one recited element, from Shima. Reconsideration of the application as presently amended, and in light of the following remarks, is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action has referred to col. 2, lines 28 to 41 of Shima for correspondence with the recited command interpretation means. The cited reference paragraph states that a printer interprets print data expressed in a specific printer control language, and prepares and prints a print image of the document. The Office Action is understood to assert that the print data sent from a host computer to a printer corresponds to a file transfer protocol command sent out by the client and that a character string in an extension in a file name field, such as LPR, corresponds to a specific character string written on a file name field of the command.

Independent claim 1, as now amended, recites, *inter alia*, the following:

... command interpretation means that interprets a file transfer protocol command sent out by the client and a character string *written on the file name field* of said command as an instruction *only* when the string is a specific character string and generates a control instruction to said electronic equipment based on the interpretation of the character string and the command (emphasis supplied).

By interpreting a command as an instruction only when the character string written on the file name field is a specific character string, even in case of a general FTP command, an instruction to make a printer execute a particular operation can be given to a printer, so that the printer notifies the host computer whether the printing is completed or not, for example. Moreover, in order to issue such instruction, there is no need to transfer a file.

However, as in Shima, if the print data includes various extension instructions to the printer, such instructions can be obtained by interpreting the data, and not by directly interpreting the file name itself. Shima teaches that the character string written on the file name field is interpreted as a file name only, and fails to teach a configuration so as to interpret as a command a file transfer protocol command together with the string only when the character string written on the file name field is a specific character string.

It is submitted, therefore, that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 through 13, recite a feature, *i.e.*, interpretation of a character string written on the file name field of a command as an instruction only when the string is a specific character string, that is not disclosed in Shima. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the application is respectfully solicited.